

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
CIVIL APPLICATION NO.1000 OF 2004
IN
APPEAL FROM ORDER (LODGING) NO.21538 OF 2003
IN
CIVIL MISC.APPEAL NO.48 OF 2001

Nivrutti Krishna Yadav ...Applicant

Versus

Sampat Shripati Pawar & Ors. ...Respondents

.....

Ms.L.M.Jenkins i/b Mr.Haresh G.Ganatra for Applicant.

None for Respondents.

CORAM: A.M.KHANWILKAR, J.

JANUARY 9, 2006.

P.C.

1. Heard Counsel for the parties.

2. As the delay is only of five days and sufficient cause is made out, Application allowed in terms of prayer clause (a).

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
CIVIL APPLICATION NO.1000 OF 2004
IN
APPEAL FROM ORDER (LODGING) NO.21538 OF 2003
IN
CIVIL MISC.APPEAL NO.48 OF 2001

Nivrutti Krishna Yadav ...Applicant

Versus

Sampat Shripati Pawar & Ors. ...Respondents

.....

CORAM: A.M.KHANWILKAR, J.

JANUARY 31, 2006.

P.C.

1. This matter is produced by the Office for speaking to the minutes of order dated 9th January 2006, pointing out that there is some error in the order dated 9th January 2006 as transcribed.

2. On verification, it is found that the said error has crept in due to some technicality while uploading the order. Hence, the order dated 9th January 2006 should read thus:

"Heard Counsel for the parties. As the delay is only of five days and sufficient cause is made out, Application allowed in terms of prayer clause (a)."

3. In the appearance, the name of the advocate for Applicant appearing as Ms.C.M.Jenkins should be read as Ms.L.M.Jenkins.

4. The date of the order, instead of January 9, 2005, be read as January 9, 2006.

5. Office to carry out necesasary corrections in the above terms and issue fresh copy of the order dated 9th January 2006.

A.M.KHANWILKAR, J.